

FILED

SEP 20 2005

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP  
DAVID M. BALABANIAN (SBN 37368)  
2 CHRISTOPHER B. HOCKETT (SBN 121539)  
JOY K. FUYUNO (SBN 193890)  
3 Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, California 94111-4067  
4 Telephone: (415) 393-2000

5 Attorneys for Defendant  
Intel Corporation  
6  
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 IAN WALKER, individually and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware  
Corporation,

15 Defendant.  
16

No. C-05-2882-MHP

STIPULATION AND [REDACTED]  
ORDER TO EXTEND TIME FOR  
DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO  
COMPLAINT

17 IT IS STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THROUGH THEIR  
18 COUNSEL AS FOLLOWS:

19 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 6-2, Plaintiff Ian Walker and Defendant Intel Corporation  
20 ("Intel") hereby stipulate that Intel's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due the earlier of  
21 (1) 60 days after transfer of the above-captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or  
22 consolidate pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 or such time for response that the  
23 transferee Court may require for any action made part of the same MDL, or (2) 45 days after any  
24 such motion has been denied. The parties request this extension of time to answer or otherwise  
25 respond because Plaintiffs in *Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp.*, No. C-05-2743 (N.D. Cal., filed July  
26

Case No. C-05-2882-MHP

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND TIME FOR DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO  
COMPLAINT

1 5, 2005), a related matter, have filed a petition to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings  
2 per 28 U.S.C. Section 1407, and the above-captioned action has been identified as a related  
3 action to that petition. As a result, the outcome of the pending petition will impact significantly  
4 the schedule of this case.

5 This is the first stipulation between the parties. Because this litigation has just  
6 begun, granting such a stipulation will not have any negative impact on the schedule of this case.

7 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.  
8 DATED: September 14, 2005

9 BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP

10  
11 By: /s/ Joy K Fuyuno  
12 Joy K. Fuyuno  
13 Attorneys for Defendant  
14 Intel Corporation

15 DATED: September 15, 2005

16 FINKELSTEIN, THOMPSON & LOUGHRAN

17  
18 By: Ali Oromchian / V.M.F.  
19 Ali Oromchian  
20 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
21 Ian Walker  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Intel Corporation's response to Plaintiff's complaint shall be due the earlier of (1) 60 days after transfer of the above-captioned case pursuant to any motion to coordinate or consolidate pre-trial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1407 or such time for response that the transferee Court may require for any action made part of the same MDL, or (2) 45 days after any such motion has been denied.

**PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED**

DATED: September 16, 2005

  
Honorable Marilyn H. Patel  
United States District Judge